

- 3 -

Serial No. 09/637,442

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13511

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 9, 2003. In response thereto, replacement drawing sheet including amended Figure 1 is submitted. No amendments to the specification or claims are made herein. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 8-19 are currently pending in the application. Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al in view of Aratow et al and Arkov et al. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of exporting data from an engine condition monitoring program database to a destination database. The method includes extracting and exporting data that comprise engine configuration data, aircraft configuration data, engine input data, engine raw output data, engine smoothed output data, aircraft input data, aircraft raw output data, aircraft smoothed output data, alert data, initialization data and compressed data. Independent claim 5 also recites a method of exporting data from an engine condition monitoring program database to a destination database having similar limitations.

Bauer et al is directed to a general method of synchronizing databases, particularly a database stored on a server with one or more remote client databases. Bauer et al clearly does not teach exporting data including engine configuration data, engine input data, engine raw output data, engine smoothed output data, alert data, and initialization data, as recited in independent claims 1 and 5.

Aratow et al is directed to a computerized flight planning system and teaches a computer system 10 having a CPU 12 and a memory including RAM 16, hard disk 18 and CD-ROM 20. A database system 44 includes several

- 4 -

Serial No. 09/637,442

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13511

databases containing various types of data (e.g., weather, terrain, aviation, aircraft parameters, and air traffic control). The system 10 also includes a display 30 that displays information from the databases to the pilot.

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Aratow's aircraft database tables with Bauer's database invention. Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Bauer et al and Aratow et al because there is insufficient motivation in the prior art to make the combination set forth by the Examiner. Bauer et al relates to applications (such as a client-server arrangement) in which data are shared in similar database structures, but the database structures do not maintain a continuous connection to a single shared data source. In other words, Bauer et al relates to applications in which multiple databases are normally maintained and need to be synchronized. Aratow et al does not involve multiple databases that share data and therefore require synchronization. Aratow et al uses a plurality of distinct databases containing different types of data. Each of these databases contains a distinct type of information, so there would be no reason to synchronize the databases of Aratow et al in the manner described by Bauer et al. In addition, neither Bauer et al nor Aratow et al suggests exporting engine condition monitoring data from one database to another. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Bauer et al and Aratow et al in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Moreover, even assuming for the sake of argument that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine Bauer et al with Aratow et al as suggested, the combination still fails to teach a method for exporting data from an engine condition monitoring system as recited in claims 1 and 5. Specifically, while Aratow et al does teach using some aircraft related data described at column 5, lines 27-36, such as takeoff performance, landing performance, cross-

- 5 -

Serial No. 09/637,442

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13511

wind limits, weight and balance, etc, there is still no showing of data types such as engine input data, engine raw output data, or engine smoothed output data as recited in the present claims. The Examiner recognizes this deficiency and relies on the Arkov et al reference for a teaching an aircraft engine condition monitoring program. While Arkov et al does discuss using engine data (specifically engine input fuel flow and engine high pressure shaft speed), there is no disclosure of extracting this information from one database and exporting it to another database. Accordingly, it is submitted that Bauer et al in view of Aratow et al and Arkov et al fails to teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1 or 5 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Each of claims 2 and 8-17 depends from independent claims 1 or 5 and is thus believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above.

The Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al in view of Aratow et al and Arkov et al and further in view of applicants admitted prior art. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to include a table of compression points with the databases found in Aratow's invention because of the statement in applicant's specification that engine condition monitoring programs do have the capability to save past history in the form of compression points. However, using compression points in the collection of engine condition data would not necessarily suggest the use of compression points with the type of data used by Aratow et al. Engine condition data is collected during flight and engine operation. The data in Aratow et al, which is used for flight planning not engine condition monitoring, is collected from external sources; there is no suggestion that this data would need to be compressed. Furthermore, even if one skilled in the art combined the alleged admitted prior art with the other references as suggested, the combination still fails to overcome

- 6 -

Serial No. 09/637,442

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13511

the above-described deficiencies of Bauer et al, Aratow et al and Arkov et al. Namely, there is no teaching of a method for exporting data from an engine condition monitoring system as recited in Independent claim 5, from which claims 18 and 19 depend.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1, 2, 5 and 8-19 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

9/9/03

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Patrick R. Scanlon
Reg. No. 34,500
207-791-1276

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 09 2003

OFFICIAL